

MALCHUS OF PHILADELPHIA

BARRY BALDWIN

“SPEZIALLITERATUR über Malchus ist nicht vorhanden.” Thus La-
queur, terminating his *Paulys Realencyclopädie* notice of the historian.¹
He was not exaggerating. There is not one item on offer in the volumes
of *L'Année Philologique*; Englemann-Preuss are equally barren for the period
1700–1850. Malchus deserves a better fate. After all, his extant fragments²
do constitute a major primary source for the reign of Zeno. Hence the present
paper.

There are two external witnesses to the existence of Malchus: Photius and
the *Suda*.³ Neither give a *floruit* for the historian, but that is not a great
impediment to knowledge. Like Olympiodorus, Priscus, Candidus the Isaurian,
and many others in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine periods, Malchus
wrote contemporary history. His animadversions upon Zeno make it most
unlikely that he could have published his work before the death of that
emperor. Admittedly, this is not conclusive. Eunapius, for instance, seems
to have got away with a surprising amount of abuse under Theodosius. But
he was operating in the relative obscurity of Sardis; Malchus was much closer
to imperial eyes.

To be subjoined is the statement in the *Suda* that Malchus wrote an account
of events from Constantine to Anastasius. As will be seen, that claim causes
problems; hence it cannot be adduced on its own to prove anything. But
taking everything together, it is utterly reasonable to assign Malchus to the
reign of Anastasius.

If the historian possessed the quality of πολιτική σύνεσις,⁴ which he attributed
both to Odovacar (fr. 10) and Pamprepicus (fr. 20), it may be that he did not
bring out his work until after 496, when Anastasius had safely crushed the
Isaurians, for it was not a version that would have stood him in good stead
had the war turned out the other way. Against this, it might with equal
justice be supposed that Malchus produced his History during the struggle
as propaganda for Anastasius. Certainly, the work is too detailed and polished
to be a “rush job.” But nothing forbids the speculation that it might have
been well under way before 491.

Both Photius and the *Suda* dub Malchus as sophist; a flexible label, not
one that tells us much. Photius, it should be remarked, dignifies him with the
title συγγραφεύς at the end of his article. A sophist writing history evokes no
surprise. There had been many others, ever since the Antonine age.^{4a} Priscus
of Panium is the most pertinent case.

¹ *RE*, 14, cols. 851–57.

² Text in Niebuhr ed. (Bonn, 1829), 231–78; Dindorf, *HGM*, I (Leipzig, 1870), 383–424; Müller
ed., *FHG*, IV (Paris, 1868), 111–32; *Excerpta de legationibus*, ed. C. de Boor (Berlin, 1903), see Index,
s.v.

³ *Bibl.*, cod. 78; *Suda*, M 120 (Adler ed.).

⁴ See *infra*, p. 106, for the literary antecedents of this phrase.

^{4a} The precise meaning of “sophist,” and its relationship with “rhetor,” has always been some-
what elusive. For a full discussion of the problem as it applies to the heyday of the Second Sophistic,

Malchus is not given to autobiographical detail. Still, there are one or two indications of a professional interest in literature and its practitioners. The wickedness of the Emperor Leo is exemplified by his relegation of the grammarian Hyperechius (fr. 2a). In the same sequence⁵ that ruler is somewhat redeemed by his gift of money to Eulogius the Philosopher, and by the hope (expressed to a eunuch who objected to the largess) that he would see the day when the military budget could be diverted to the teaching profession.⁶ Finally, in the detailed account of Pamprepus (fr. 20), there is the obtruded comment that he was intrigued against by an enemy with "more knavery than befitted a teacher."

The historian's nomenclature discloses his geographical origins, for Malchus was a Syrian name meaning "king," which is certified by both Eunapius and John Lydus.⁷ Hence, when Photius assigns him to Philadelphia, one can be sure that the Palestinian city is meant.

The *Suda*, presumably following Hesychius of Miletus, regards Malchus as Βυζάντιος. The epithet must indicate provenance. Elsewhere⁸ in the *Suda*, it denotes place of birth. The adjective is employed both of old Byzantium and of Constantinople.⁹ Either Hesychius or his epigones are in error, which is of moment, given other problems¹⁰ in the lexicon's notice of Malchus.

However, it is a reasonable conjecture that Malchus spent a good season of his life in Constantinople. The *Suda* singles out his description of the great fire which ravaged the capital under Basiliscus as one of the finest sequences in his history. The destruction of the library elicited a narrative "reminiscent of a tragedy." To be sure, a conflagration sounds like an excuse for a literary set piece. Photius was impressed by the description achieved by Candidus the Isaurian of a similar fire in the city of Leo's time. Indeed, one historian might well have been trying to outdo the other.

see G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 12–14. As to the later Roman and Early Byzantine periods, the formulation of Victorinus (*Rhetores Latini Minores*, ed. Halm, 156.21) may be instructive: *dicendum etiam videtur, quae distantia sit inter rhetorem, sophistam, et oratorem. Rhetor est qui docet litteras atque artes tradit eloquentiae: sophista est apud quem dicendi exercitium discitur: orator est qui in causis privatis ac publicis plena et perfecta utitur eloquentia*. It may also be instructive to consider the three separate definitions offered by the *Suda*, S 812–14 (Adler). The word σοφιστής does not commonly occur in later Greek texts: the Lexicon of E. A. Sophocles registers only Lucian, *Peregrinus*, 13 (where the word is applied to Christ); Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) has no examples. In the period in question, "Sophist" seems to me to denote a teacher or professor, though, given that the term "rhetor" can mean "lawyer" in early Byzantine Greek (cf. Alan and Averil Cameron, "The Cycle of Agathias," *JHS*, 86 [1966], 15–16), we should be alive to possible mutations of meaning. See further the article by K. Gerth, in *RE*, Suppl. Band 8, col. 723.

⁵ Bearing in mind that this is awkwardly juxtaposed with the balance of fr. 2a, and might be either deficient or misplaced; cf. Müller, *loc. cit.*

⁶ Which, of course, recalls the similar optimism of Probus claimed by the *HA*, *Probus*, 20. 3.

⁷ Eunapius, *VS*, Giangrande ed., iv. 1. 4; Lydus, *De Mensibus*, 4. 118.

⁸ There are thirteen occurrences registered in Adler's index. All are in biographical notices deriving from Hesychius.

⁹ E.g., A 3933 (Aristophanes of Byzantium); E 851 (Heliconius, sophist and author of a chronicle from Adam to Theodosius I); M 174 (Maximus, the teacher of Julian). In this last case, note that Maximus is said to be "either Epirote or Byzantine," which confirms the usage. The *Suda* is doubly in error, for the Maximus in question hailed from Ephesus; cf. *PLRE*, I (Cambridge, 1971), 584.

¹⁰ Specifically, the scope of Malchus' work, for which see *infra*.

For all of that, the extant fragments do not suggest that Malchus wasted much space on set pieces. Grief over the destruction of the library at Constantinople would come naturally from a man of letters who used and appreciated its facilities. He also wrote eloquently, adds the *Suda*, on the fate of statues in the Augusteum. That betokens a precision of detail acquired by autopsy.

He may have been widely traveled. Photius calls attention to the degree to which both East and West feature in the historian's narrative. He never seems handicapped, as Eunapius¹¹ had been, by the difficulty of obtaining Western news in the East. The detailed accounts of Gothic peregrinations (frs. 15–19) abound with topographical minutiae: Sondis is a great mountain, hard to climb; the road to New Epirus is narrow; Lychidnus is full of springs; Adamantius is the first commander to traverse an obscure and narrow road with cavalry; and so on.

Of course, one can never be sure what comes from a man's experience and what from his reading. Malchus never refers to exploits of his own, as do, for example, Olympiodorus and Priscus.¹² Nor does he formally credit any information to sources oral or written. Anything is possible. Some eyewitnesses will surely have been accessible to the historian. Literary materials were not lacking. On geographical matters, he might follow the example of Olympiodorus and consult a writer such as Asinius Quadratus, invariably cited for topographical points in later authorities.¹³ In Malchus' own time, there was Capito Lycus, whose *Isaurica* are always adduced in later ages for geographical items.¹⁴

Men of letters tended to roam widely, in search of patrons and success.¹⁵ Malchus need not have been an exception. His obvious sympathy for Pamprepus may be that of a fellow professional. One also cannot help wondering if he was ever entrusted with a diplomatic mission which enabled him to see something of the world. It is well known that Olympiodorus and Priscus were both so employed; the phenomenon recurs with Nonnosus in the reign of Justinian.¹⁶ And the age was propitious for literary men. According to John Lydus,¹⁷ Anastasius gave preferment to them as a matter of policy.

Embassies are a major theme in the narratives of Malchus. A good three-quarters of the extant fragments are preserved in the *De legationibus* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Of course caution must be exercised against

¹¹ Fr. 74.

¹² On Olympiodorus, see E. A. Thompson, "Olympiodorus of Thebes," *CQ*, 38 (1944), 43–52; J. F. Matthews, "Olympiodorus of Thebes and the History of the West," *JRS*, 60 (1970), 79–97. Fr. 18 describes his mission to the Hun king Donatus. Priscus' account (fr. 8) of his visit to Attila is too familiar to require comment.

¹³ For Quadratus, consult Jacoby, *FGrHist*, 97; cf. Zosimus 5. 27 for Olympiodorus and Quadratus on the subject of Ravenna.

¹⁴ Text in Müller, *FHG*, IV, 133–34.

¹⁵ See the brilliant article by Alan Cameron, "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt," *Historia*, 14 (1965), 470–509.

¹⁶ Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 3, is the source for Nonnosus (whose father and grandfather had been on similar missions).

¹⁷ *De mag.*, 3. 50.

being misled by collections of fragments. The true proportion of embassies in Malchus' History may be distorted, or it may not; either way, there is no overt autobiographical content.

One ingredient is conspicuous by its absence; the military one. The Gothic narratives, not excluding the lengthy fragment 18 (the most elaborate sequence surviving from Malchus' work), disclose not a single set piece describing battle or siege. Which means, mercifully, that our historian does not slump to the level of Priscus of Panium, who did not shrink from turning out a siege narrative that owed more to Thucydidean pastiche than to reality.¹⁸

Obviously, there is again the risk of being misled by the nature of the extant fragments and their provenance. There must have been *some* military detail in a seven-book history of the years 474–80. And it is true that the general Heraclius is commended (fr. 5) for valor, whereas Zeno is denounced (fr. 9) for cowardice. Yet it is notable that there is no elaborate encomium of any general on a par with the praise of the prefect Erythrius (fr. 6) for his virtue. Moreover, Leo's aforementioned hope of diverting money from the army to the teachers is clearly approved by the historian. One is not going to assert that Malchus was a pacifist. And it must be remembered that a man of letters could also be proficient in the service of Mars. The most pertinent example of that symbiosis was P. Herennius Dexippus, a historian much admired in the fourth and fifth centuries.¹⁹ Still, disenchantment with the military mentality is readily understood in one who had endured the Isaurian domination of Constantinople.

In all candor, there is virtually no real information on Malchus. The extant fragments do not have the autobiographical indulgence of an Olympiodorus. It has been observed that the two external sources are discrepant on the matter of his native city. Similar trouble will soon be manifest with regard to the scope of his work. Before grappling with that, however, one highly personal and pertinent issue remains: the religion of Malchus.

A vexed question. There have been those²⁰ who regarded him as a pagan; others²¹ enroll him amongst the Christians. The vacillations of Bury are instructive. In his edition of Gibbon,²² he opined that Malchus was "indifferent to religion"; in his *History of the Later Roman Empire* of 1889²³ he expressed the view: "In regard to his religion I should be inclined to suppose that he was a Laodicean"; in the fuller version emitted in 1923, Malchus had become "plainly Neoplatonic."²⁴

¹⁸ Ably demonstrated by E. A. Thompson, "Priscus of Panium, Fragment 1b," *CQ*, 39 (1945), 61–65.

¹⁹ The *testimonia* are assembled by Jacoby, *FGrHist*, 100; cf. F. Millar, "P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions," *JRS*, 59 (1969), 12–29.

²⁰ Laqueur, in his *RE* notice, col. 856; Stein, *Bas-Empire*, II (Paris, 1949), 708 note 1 ("sans doute").

²¹ Notably Averil Cameron, in her splendid book *Agathias* (Oxford, 1970), 83; albeit, she is slightly misleading, as we shall see, in her statement that Photius "expressly says he was a Christian." One of the sources of the problem is the Patriarch's cryptic language.

²² Vol. IV, 512.

²³ Vol. I, 328.

²⁴ Vol. II, 418 note 2.

Malchus himself has little to offer concerning religious matters, which is one source of the problem. It need not be supposed that he entertained dangerously unorthodox opinions which had to be kept quiet, since both pagans and heretics were reasonably safe under Anastasius. Rather, a genuine indifference might be imputed.

Or honest incertitude; for there is no consistency in the comments Malchus does venture. On the one hand, the "vengeance of God" overtakes the cruel general Heraclius (fr. 4), whilst "the Overseer of All Things" strikes down the debauched son of Zeno (fr. 9). The latter passage seems inescapably Christian, very much in tune with the morality of Anastasius.²⁵

In flagrant contrast, Malchus is well-disposed toward the notorious Pamprepus, who became something of a diabolical bogeyman in Christian versions.²⁶ He is represented as the star pupil of the "great Proclus"—in itself, a significant tribute²⁷—and as one who was both conventionally and unconventionally wise. Undone by schemers in Athens, after a long tenure in that city of pagan learning, he came to Constantinople and bravely flaunted his unchristian beliefs, a man ἀγαθὸς καὶ χρηστός.

To some extent this is political, not religious, propaganda. In the eyes of Malchus a fellow who threw in his lot with the rebels against Zeno could not be all bad. It is clear from Photius that the version of Candidus the Isaurian was very different. On the question of Pamprepus' prophetic talents, Malchus is sensibly agnostic: εἰ δέ τι καὶ ἄλλο ἦν, οὔτε ἰσχυρῶς ἀνελεῖν ἔχω, οὔτε πείθεσθαι. The matter clearly exercised him, for Malchus does not often obtrude such personal views into his narratives.²⁸

Nothing can be ascertained from Malchus' allusions to Christianity. It is now recognized that the objective conventions for referring to the sect constitute a question of style, not belief.²⁹ As with other Early Byzantine historians, Malchus is inconsistent. Sometimes he introduces a Christian technicality such as *presbyter* with a paraphrase (fr. 18); occasionally he exhibits a formula of the stamp of τῶν λεγομένων μοναχῶν (fr. 7); when the mood takes him, a Christian official is brought in as ἀρχιερεὺς (fr. 18, bis); yet spade is sometimes called spade, as in fragment 1, where ἐπίσκοπος is employed without qualification (coexisting, let it be noted, with ἱερεὺς for clergyman).

The problem is exacerbated by Photius, who rounded off his notice of the historian with the words οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ Χριστιανικοῦ θειασμοῦ. This cryptic phrase

²⁵ Evincing by his suppression of the licentious Brytae festival.

²⁶ In the Photian paraphrase of Candidus (*Bibl.*, cod. 79), Pamprepus is branded as δυσσεβής; it is immaterial here whether the epithet is the Patriarch's or the historian's. Henry is surely wrong to translate it as "hérétique" in his Budé edition (Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. R. Henry, I [Paris, 1959]). On Pamprepus in general, see the classic article of J. R. Asmus, in *BZ*, 22 (1913), 320–47; also Alan Cameron, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

²⁷ Though perhaps overrated by Bury, *LRE* (1923), II, 418 note 2. Neoplatonism and Christianity were not always mutually exclusive, although Photius tends to be wary of any interest manifested in the former; cf. Alan Cameron, *op. cit.*, 476.

²⁸ Apart from the present passage, the only other such formula is in fr. 18, where Malchus asserts for the second time that the Gothic complaints against Zeno were justified.

²⁹ This topic is analyzed at length by Averil Cameron, *Agathias*, 83–88; cf. the Camerons' joint article, "Christianity and Tradition in the Historiography of the Late Empire," *CQ*, 14 (1964), 316–27.

stands in palpable contrast with the straightforward labeling of Eunapius and Olympiodorus as pagans and Candidus as orthodox in the contiguous notices (cods. 77, 79, 80).

What does it mean? The noun θειασμός is rarely employed in patristic prose. It can, however, be applied both to paganism and Christianity.³⁰ The word connotes religious spirit or feeling rather than simply "religion." For the latter, the regular term in Photius is θρησκεία.

There is a clue. It is to be expiscated from the Patriarch's notice of Synesius of Cyrene (cod. 26). He was detached from paganism and was advanced to a condition of πρὸς τὸν θειασμὸν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ νεύσαντα.³¹ He remained thus until he finally overcame his reservations about the doctrine of the Resurrection, upon which decision he was admitted to the true faith.

It would appear that Photius did not regard Malchus as a committed orthodox Christian. Nor will there have been anything rabidly pagan in the historian's writings. It was for the Patriarch to assess the balance between the Christian-sounding utterances about God's vengeance and the reasoned compliments to Proclus and Pamprepis. There was clearly not very much about religion in Malchus, certainly no extreme views for or against any side. Had there been, the historian would have been more precisely labeled by Photius.³²

According to the *Suda*, Malchus produced a history (no title is given) of events ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας Κωνσταντίνου καὶ ἕως Ἀναστασίου. Photius states that he had read a work entitled *Byzantiaca*, an account in seven books of events from the last illness of Leo in 474 to the death of Julius Nepos in 480. The Patriarch subjoins that the exordium to Book One mentioned other narratives (which Photius clearly had not read); also that the conclusion to the final book promised further work, which (it is presumed) was aborted by Malchus' death.

The Photian version is credible. It is probably no more than a coincidence that seven years are covered by seven books; I shall beware of the imposition of any pattern here. Detailed narratives covering a relatively short span of time were popular in the fifth and sixth centuries. Olympiodorus consecrated twenty-two books to the period 407–25; Priscus devoted his efforts to the years 433–74; Candidus dealt with the reigns of Leo and Zeno; specialized

³⁰ Lampe's *Patristic Greek Lexicon* gives only Evagrius, 5. 21 (applied to paganism); Theodetus, *Affect.*, 10, and Basil Seleucius, *Vita Theclae*, 2. 12 (used of Christianity).

³¹ I have found no other example of this formula in the *Bibliotheca*.

³² There was a time when I wondered if Malchus might not have been a Monophysite. It would suit the historian's hatred of Leo, which is more pronounced than the contempt evinced for Zeno. The sect was notoriously congenial to Anastasius, under whom it was possible to publish a monophysite version of events. Alternatively, the playing down of religion by Malchus could imply adherence to the doctrine. T. F. Carney, *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1971), 49–50, 69 note 11, has argued along these lines in the case of John Lydus. Finally, although a hazardous argument, it should be noted that the sect was popular in Syria. In spite of all this, unless the extant fragments are quite misleading, there is probably too little about religion in Malchus to suit the view. The theory is also embarrassed by the historian's dislike of Basiliscus and his readiness to criticize the policies of that Monophysite usurper (fr. 7). Finally, it is hard to see why Photius would not have identified and stigmatized theological error in the case of Malchus with the precision elsewhere employed in the *Bibliotheca*.

narratives continue in the sixth century, evidenced by Procopius, Agathias, Menander Protector, and Theophylact.

It is not cause for alarm that the period covered by Malchus affords no precise continuation of a predecessor and does not subsume the formal limits of a reign or reigns. Patterns congenial to modern habits of thinking are to be eschewed. Olympiodorus left a gap of a good two years between the end of Eunapius' history and the commencement of his own. Priscus does not directly follow upon Olympiodorus, and does not use imperial death or succession as a starting point. A specialized account of the period 474–80 is quite plausible.

The limits indicated by Photius are largely confirmed by the extant fragments, all of which can be fitted into the period in question. That is, the passages assigned and printed by Müller. However, a number of other items in the *Suda* have been tentatively given to Malchus by other scholars. One of them, a detailed and pejorative account of the power of Zeno's brother Longinus, does not easily fit the limits 474–80, although it will be seen that the ascription is hard to resist on the criteria of content and style.³³ Hence, it is worth canvassing several possible explanations of the discrepancy between Photius and the *Suda*:

1. The *Suda* is simply wrong. That is always a convenient and reasonable notion; especially when, as was earlier shown, it is in error over the provenance of Malchus.

2. The *Suda* is right. Such an assumption would seem to invalidate the assertion of Photius that death prevented Malchus from continuing beyond 480.

3. Something is wrong both with the text of the *Suda* and modern understanding of it. In cause are punctuation and the word καί. Müller has a comma before the copulative; Adler does not. Without one, the force of καί has to be intensive. However, a laborious (*experto crede!*) perusal of all the biographical items in the *Suda* has disclosed that this would be unparalleled. The word ξως occurs four times³⁴ in descriptions of titles. In all cases, it is unadorned by καί. Significantly, one of the authors in question is no less than Hesychius of Miletus himself, the source of the biographical entries in the *Suda*. This would imply that ξως by itself is the regular Hesychian formula. The other authors are a historian named Jason and the biographer Suetonius.

Given all this, καί in the Malchus notice must be copulative.³⁵ The text of the *Suda* may be garbled or corrupted. It could conceal the existence of two separate works by Malchus: a general account of the period between Constantine and Anastasius, and the more specific narrative described by Photius. Such a conclusion would vindicate the Patriarch's claim that other writings by Malchus were mentioned in the historian's opening to *Byzantiaca*. The abortive project to cover events after 480 will have been the continuation of

³³ *Suda*, L 646 (Adler); see later for this and other fragments possibly belonging to Malchus.

³⁴ Including the notice of Malchus; the others are: H 611 (Hesychius); I 53 (Jason); T 895 (Suetonius Tranquillus).

³⁵ For καί as unarguably copulative before ξως, see, e.g., K 1165 (Adler).

this work on the same detailed scale. It does not mean that Malchus nowhere wrote about events down to 491.

4. One objection to the foregoing hypothesis would be that a general account of the period between Constantine and Anastasius is an unlikely project in an age of contemporary history written in great detail. The only impetus for such a work would be religious, and we have seen that that was one of the inspirations least likely to afflict Malchus of Philadelphia.

Therefore, it can still be maintained that the work described by Photius was the only one issued by Malchus. Events prior to 474 will have been cursorily surveyed in an introductory form, on a very much smaller scale than that discerned in Photius and the surviving passages. One can adduce, for easy instance, Ammianus and Eunapius for similar disproportions (Zosimus will also be thought of). Items pertaining to events and personalities between 480 and the accession of Anastasius could have featured in the seven books known to Photius. Just as Eunapius inserted a reference to Pulcheria and the year 414 (fr. 87) in a work that stopped at 404 (according to Photius), so Malchus might frequently have looked ahead in his narratives for comparative materials and the like. This would explain the aforementioned diatribe against the brother of Zeno. A careless reading of such a work might have led the *Suda*'s compiler to describe the work as going down to Anastasius.

Speculations tend to be endless, unless decently restrained. Many more might be advanced. There could have been a second edition of Malchus, drastically reduced in temporal scope and vastly intensified in detail;³⁶ or the Constantine referred to was not the great emperor of that name, but Constantine III: that would relate the History of Malchus to the work of Olympiodorus; or Constantine is not an emperor at all, but an error for Flavius Constantine, consul in 457. That would give the accession of Leo as a starting point, which is far from incredible.

Such notions, mercifully, need play no part in the forthcoming assessments of the content, style, and value of Malchus' work, although the discrepancy between Photius and the *Suda* must be faced, especially as it is not always noted in standard treatments of the period.³⁷

However, conjecture is not henceforth to be banished from this paper. It is time to advert to the fragments themselves. Of those printed by Müller, a number derive from the *Suda* in anonymous form. The ascriptions to Malchus are the work of modern scholars, and various efforts have been made over the years to augment and diminish their number. This sort of business tends to be tediously unprofitable. Yet some dividends are to be had in the present investigation; and there is the bonus of an opportunity to consider some aspects of Candidus the Isaurian.

³⁶ Though Photius is usually informed on such things. And the last thing we need is another *μέγα ἔκδοσις* problem on the scale of the Eunapian one; cf. W. R. Chalmers, in *CQ*, 3 (1953), 165–70.

³⁷ Bury acknowledged the issue in his edition of Gibbon (*supra*, note 22), but in his *LRE* of 1923 merely says that "Malchus continued Priscus and embraced in his work either the whole or a part of the reign of Zeno." A. H. M. Jones in his monumental *History of the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964), 217, simply gives Malchus as a source for the years 474–80, with no comment at all.

In Müller's collection, the following items from the *Suda* are credited to Malchus: fr. 2a (Leo); fr. 5 (Heraclius the general); fr. 6 (Erythrius the prefect); fr. 7 (Basiliscus the usurper); fr. 8 (Harmatus); fr. 9 (Zeno); fr. 20 (Pamprepius); fr. 21 (entries under the words ἐπετίμα and λέπρα).

One or two observations are in order. The name of Malchus is attached to fragments 2a and 21, but this does not certify them. False ascriptions are hardly uncommon in the *Suda*. Müller appended to fragment 21 two items from the *Anabasis* of Xenophon wrongly attributed to Malchus. We shall see later, when scrutinizing the historian's style, how that particular error might have originated.

Müller entertained some very reasonable doubts about the last two sentences of fragment 2a. As mentioned earlier, they seem to belong somewhere else, albeit Malchus can retain the authorship. It suits his outlook to exemplify the villainy of Leo by the expulsion of a grammarian, as does adverse comment on the expensiveness of the army. And the verbatim quotation of Leo is very much in the manner of Malchus, who (details are supplied later) had some taste for speeches and a marked fondness for quoting the utterances of Zeno.

Fragment 5 was given to Malchus by Valesius: there is nothing decisive to be said either way. The next fragment is appropriate to Malchus with its denunciation of the rapacity of Leo and the fatal generosity of Zeno. It is not something Candidus could have written. One may observe from a Latin source how the partisans of Zeno defended his openhanded behavior.³⁸

Fragments 7 and 8 have greater import. The latter is really made up of two (perhaps three) distinct notices of Harmatus and Harmatius; Bury was disposed to accept the view of Shestakov that at least parts of fragments 7 and 8 emanate from Candidus.³⁹ A number of scholars⁴⁰ have assigned the article on Harmatus to the Isaurian on the grounds of orthography. For this unsavory character is Harmatus in the Photian paraphrases of Candidus, but Harmatius in fragment 11 of Malchus.⁴¹

The reasoning is in order, but perhaps not strong. The article on Harmatius in the *Suda* (E 3968, Adler) comes before the Harmatus entry, directly following the item Ἀρμάτειος τροχός. The spelling of Harmatius could have been affected by this proximity. Moreover, in the best manuscript of Photius, Harmatius is corrected by a marginal hand to Harmatus.⁴²

A passage not printed by Müller must be summoned to the argument. A notice in the *Suda* (L 646, Adler)⁴³ takes the form of an assault on the

³⁸ *Anon. Vales.*, 40: *in re publica omnino providentissimus, favens genti suae*.

³⁹ See his edition of Gibbon (IV, 511) and the 1923 version of his *LRE*, I, 392 note 1. Shestakov's demonstration, which I know only from Bury (and could not read, anyway) is in his *Candid Isauriski* (Odessa, 1894). C. D. Gordon, *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, 1960), 146–47, prints the Harmatus notice as fr. 8, dividing the Harmatius one into 8a and 8c (the break coming at the introduction of Onoulph into the narrative), and renumbering Müller's 8a as 8b. Gordon, however, simply spells the pertinent name Harmatius throughout.

⁴⁰ Registered by Müller, *loc. cit.*

⁴¹ Not fr. 10, as Müller; cf. John of Antioch, fr. 210, who has Harmatius.

⁴² According to Henry's apparatus. Incidentally, is it possible that the orthographical vagaries are at least partly due to the *Isaurica* of Pamprepius and its metrical requirements?

⁴³ Adler did not observe that one sentence from this extract recurs in the entry P 1436, sandwiched between phrases from Polybius and the Emperor Julian.

rapacity and lust of Longinus and Conon, brothers of Zeno. Bernhardt credited the sequence to Malchus; Bury thought that was probably right; and it has more recently been adduced without any argument as a piece of Malchus.⁴⁴

This is most likely so. Candidus will not have so denounced the brothers of Zeno.⁴⁵ Stylistic analysis strongly suggests that the same hand produced fragment 8, if not fragment 7, and also fragment 9. Sexual lust is a common theme to the three sequences. In fragment 9, the son of Zeno is the target; in the new extract, it is the Emperor's brothers. Another common feature is the arrogance of these sex-mad grandees.

Details of vocabulary accumulate. The adverb ἐκτόπως, for instance, occurs in erotic contexts in fragments 8 and 9. Striking *hapax legomena* are on parade. Fragment 8 exhibits εὐπαρόδεντος in an erotic sequence;⁴⁶ the Longinus notice offers γυναικιδιέραι in a similar context;⁴⁷ fragment 9 boasts one unique usage (the adverb συμβαριτικῶς) in an attack on sexual excess. Carnal themes also evoke literary parody. In fragment 8, the Harmatus section contains a chunk of Plutarch, with slight variations including a *hapax legomenon*;⁴⁸ the Longinus passage discloses the proverbial πεῖθανάγκη in the context of seduction.

Fragment 7 contains two graphic and rare epithets: εὐεπίτευκτος and βραδύνους. It also mingles unvarnished Christian terminology and the objective convention, with ἐπίσκοπος (twice) sharing a sentence with τῶν λεγομένων μοναχῶν. This is typical of Malchus.

Linguistic statistics rarely prove anything. However, it would seem reasonable to believe that fragments 8 and 9, and the Longinus notice, are from the same pen. Fragment 9 is certainly by Malchus. Thus, the Harmatus and Longinus passages may be credited to him. The recurring presence of *hapax legomena* is compelling: Photius records that neologisms are a feature of Malchus' style.

In addition to the assault on Longinus, nine other anonymous items in the *Suda* have been tentatively credited to Malchus, in most cases by Bernhardt.⁴⁹ The majority of these are brief notices of particular words; only rarely is speculation worthwhile.⁵⁰ Two, however, are fairly substantial notices of individuals: the Patriarch Acacius and the prefect Epinicus.

The entry on Acacius is probably too elaborate for Malchus, who seems not to have been given to theological minutiae and the fortunes of ecclesiastics. The notice is more suited to Candidus, an orthodox Christian, who, according to Photius, spread himself on such matters. A reference to Leo the "Butcher,"

⁴⁴ Gordon, *op. cit.*, 155.

⁴⁵ Nor is it likely that Capito the Lycian would have been so scathing. Pamprepus is ruled out by the fact that his *Isaurica* was in verse (on this, see Alan Cameron, *op. cit.*, 481), a venal performance in honor of Zeno's restoration. It is true that the eminence of Longinus came after 480; but (as earlier argued) Malchus is not precluded from treating events after that date, and the follies of Longinus will have been grist to his anti-Zeno mill.

⁴⁶ The notice also contains the unparalleled epithet ἐρυσροπρόσωπος.

⁴⁷ Notice also the employment of περικάρπια in the rare sense of "bracelets," a usage certified by Pollux, 5. 99; Gordon mistranslates as "nut-shells."

⁴⁸ See *infra*, for details.

⁴⁹ The items are (in Adler): A 783; B 134; E 226; E 566; E 2369; E 2494; I 324; K 693; T 513.

⁵⁰ B 134 is possible, since the word in question is the *hapax legomenon* βαρυπρέπης.

however, would come more naturally from Malchus. It may be that the *Suda* has conflated accounts.

By contrast, the assault on Epinicus looks very much like an extract from Malchus.⁵¹ In content and tone, it is very similar to the diatribe against Sebastian in fragment 9. Vignettes of erring officials are congenial to Malchus. Two linguistic details may be suggestive. The verb καπηλεύω is employed of both villains (in the present participle on both occasions), and their profits are summed up in both notices as κλέμματα.

We may now proceed to consider the History of Malchus in terms of its content and attitudes. The details singled out by Photius should be set alongside the surviving fragments. It may be observed that the Patriarch does not enlighten us as to the main contents of each book, as he does in the case of Candidus. Since Photius attempted to reproduce the flavor and style of his authors,⁵² it is legitimate to believe that we are close to what Malchus actually wrote.

The *Byzantiaca* began with the fatal illness of Leo in 474. It is probable that the historian indulged in a gloating account of this. The Photian phrase νόσος ἐπείλει is suggestive; Malchus loathed Leo; and the unpleasant details given in fragment 9 concerning the death of Zeno's depraved son indicate a liking for such descriptions on the part of Malchus.

Singled out next are the predictable themes of Zeno's proclamation, the Basiliscus interlude, Zeno's return, and the liquidation of the usurper and his family παρὰ νόμῳ κρίσει. Is this last phrase the historian's or the Patriarch's? Probably the former's: Photius will have had scant sympathy for the Monophysite usurper. Fragment 8a and the first part of fragment 9 preserve some of Malchus' account of these transactions. The execution of Harmatus by Onulph is then mentioned. The latter is not named in Photius' résumé of Candidus, which would seem to guarantee the final section of fragment 8 as attributable to Malchus.

Photius then adduces the accounts of the two Theodorics, which constitute the fullest surviving fragments. The machinations of Verina against Illus are mentioned next. Malchus may well have taken the opportunity to tell much or all of the story of Illus, into which narrative his account of Pamprepius could well be fitted. The revolt and suppression of Marcian follows. Malchus brings his seventh and last book to an end with the death of Nepos.

The résumé by Photius and the fragments largely confirm each other. Only fragment 1, the fascinating account of the visit to Constantinople by Amorgesos, the renegade Persian, in 473, falls outside the Patriarch's given limits for the History. There is no cause for alarm. The episode caters to two of Malchus' predilections: accounts of embassies and objurgation of Leo.

⁵¹ It is generally accepted that this notice is from Malchus or Candidus. The passage contains at least one error: Epinicus was clearly praetorian prefect, not urban, to judge by the account of his provincial depredations. Gordon also thinks that Epinicus' tenure cannot relate to Basiliscus' reign, and that he was followed by Sebastian, not Laurentius.

⁵² See the Introduction to Henry's Budé, xxiv.

Inevitably, there is a good deal of overlap with Candidus. It should be kept in mind that Photius does not supply the title of the latter's work. In view of his Isaurian connections, and his efforts to derive the race from Esau (a folly twice deprecated by Photius), *Isaurica* would be a fair bet. Many details will have been common to the two historians, which complicates the ascription of anonymous fragments. But they are clearly distinguished by their attitudes to Leo and Zeno, and by their religion. Candidus included a good deal of theological material; Malchus did not. The latter approved of Pamprepicus, whereas to Candidus he was *δυσσεβής*. Recollection of these differences, and the summaries of Photius, helps one to reasonable decisions as to which fragment belongs to whom.

Malchus was not the only Eastern historian of the time to deal with Western affairs. It is clear from Photius that Candidus dealt with these in his first and second books. Given the history of the period, no historian worth the name could have altogether eschewed them. Still, it is worth remarking how Photius emphasizes Malchus' treatment: ταῦτα διεξίγων, διέξεισι καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς.

Our historian began his seven books with the death of an Eastern emperor, and closed them with the expiration of a Western prince, Julius Nepos. That is surely a contrived effect, given that the *Byzantiaca* as described by Photius was intended as a self-contained whole. Three of the extant fragments (3, 10, and 13) bear upon the comings and goings of embassies to and from Constantinople. In one (fr. 3), Zeno sends the excellent senator Severus to Carthage to treat with Gaiseric; this is balanced by fragment 13, in which Huneric despatches Alexander, the guardian of Olybrius' wife, to Zeno in 478. Between these sequences there occurs the senatorial mission from Rome on behalf of Augustulus.

Writing under Anastasius, Malchus may have intended a protreptic effect. Given his attitude to Zeno, he will almost certainly have deplored that Emperor's actions vis-à-vis Theodoric and the West; especially as the historian is not enamored of barbarians. They are twice attacked collectively for perfidy and greed (frs. 8a, 19); Onulph is singled out as representative of the former vice. The account of Severus' visit to Carthage manages (in the portion we have) never to mention Gaiseric by name: he is always "the Vandal."⁵³

It is refreshingly probable that Malchus did not fill his pages with noble savages and rhetorical comparisons between primitive virtue and the vices of civilization. Indeed, one reads in fragment 13 an attack on the soft-living luxury of the Vandals after Gaiseric, in which there is no talk of contamination by Roman manners. However, his approach is eclectic. The epigram on barbarian greed (fr. 19) is offset by the comment, twice repeated, that the complaints of Theodoric against Zeno were justified (fr. 18), and the unsavory Onulph needs to be balanced against Odovacar, who shares with Pamprepicus the quality of πολιτική σύνεσις.

Leo is unsparingly vilified. He is the "Butcher," rapacious, an object of dread to subjects and enemies alike, an unleasher of informers and cognate

⁵³ In fr. 13 he is obliged to name Gaiseric, to distinguish him from Huneric.

evils: in short, a πάσης κακίας καταγώγιον (fr. 2a), whose successes were simply the product of his being "the luckiest of all rulers."

These tirades naturally evoke suspicion, being rhetorically shrill and stuffed with the clichés of abuse. It is clear that Malchus is less than fair. His criticism of Leo for giving seating precedence over the patricians to the important visitor Amorkesos (fr. 1) looks like a piece of silly snobbery. On the other hand, his concern about Leo's lack of security-mindedness regarding what this far from trustworthy Persian was allowed to see in the cities is quite legitimate. Moreover, as was observed earlier, the portrait of Leo is not totally black: he did sometimes favor intellectuals and lament the need to cosset the military (fr. 2a).

On Zeno, Malchus is hard, sometimes inconsistent, and not pitiless. The low condition of affairs under him is described in language almost identical to that employed of Leo,⁵⁴ a device intended to condition the reader. Yet Zeno is not all bad. He was less cruel and greedy than his predecessor and not so inclined to extortion and the use of informers (fr. 9). Some capacity for human feeling is evinced by the pity he felt for Nepos (fr. 10).

The trouble with Zeno was that he was unsuited to his position; he lacked the ἐπιστήμη appropriate to a ruler (fr. 9). He was too prodigal toward his creatures (fr. 6), too malleable in the hands of a Sebastian (fr. 9). Worst of all, he was a terrible coward, ἀνὴρ ἀπόλεμος (fr. 3), a man συμφύτου δειλίας (fr. 16).⁵⁵

Malchus is not at his most impressive here. He sees the mission of Severus to Carthage simply in terms of Zeno's cowardice. No mention is made of the two tangible benefits which resulted: a long peace between Constantinople and the Vandals, and a respite from persecution for the orthodox Christians of Africa.⁵⁶ Elsewhere (fr. 19), it is admitted that Zeno preferred war to a "shameful peace." Other accusations also do not ring true. The Emperor is accused (fr. 11) of using agents to do his dirty work for him to save his own reputation. Yet he put his own name to the embarrassing ransom offered to the Goths for the release of the general Heraclius (fr. 4).

The son and brothers of Zeno are castigated for their debauchery, as was earlier seen. Basiliscus is something of a compound of Leo and Zeno: successful in battle (fr. 7),⁵⁷ but fatally led by his creatures and so compelled to ruthless taxation. It can be observed that Malchus, like many another ancient historian of Rome and Byzantium, is too glib on this topic. The fiscal realities and genuine needs of an emperor tend not to be admitted.

Imperial women play a small but discernible role in the extant narratives. The separate influence of Verina is stressed (fr. 17), and that influence is a

⁵⁴ Compare πάντων πανταχόθεν τεταράχθαι δοκούντων (fr. 1) with πολλῆς πανταχόθεν ταραχῆς ἐφεστώσης (fr. 3).

⁵⁵ A version clearly influencing John Lydus who (*De mag.*, 3. 45) claims that Zeno could not even bear to gaze upon a picture of a battle!

⁵⁶ Cf. Victor Vitensis, 1. 17; Procopius, *Bell. Vand.*, 1. 7.

⁵⁷ An interesting judgment, in view of his performance in the great expedition against the Vandals under Leo. One might have thought Malchus was simply referring to his overthrow of Zeno, but the passage is a generalizing study of the career and character of Basiliscus.

great one (fr. 20: τότε μέγιστα δυναμένη).⁵⁸ No epigrams on female wiles occur in these sequences. In the case of Zenonis (fr. 8), however, the historian's language plainly condemns her affair with Harmatus.

The surviving portraits of individuals indicate that Malchus, like many historians, found abuse more congenial than praise. Apart from the sequence on Pamprepius, the only⁵⁹ full-scale laudation is on the prefect Erythrius, who resigned under Zeno rather than inflict suffering on the taxpayers. It has been shown by Alan Cameron⁶⁰ that this encomium is part of some literary and political infighting; Malchus is on the other side than that of the poet Panolbius, whose distinguished targets included our good prefect.

It would be naive to take Malchus on such characters as Sebastian as gospel. One is encouraged, however, by indications that the historian portrays his subjects in colors other than black and white. This has already been observed in the cases of even Leo and Zeno. Similar treatments are those allotted to Heraclius (fr. 5), Basiliscus (fr. 7), and Harmatus (fr. 8)—this last had been kind to his executioner Onulph.

The main features of Malchus as historian have come to light in the foregoing accounts. Some recapitulation and supplement is in order. It will naturally be understood that there may be built-in distortion of the true picture, thanks to the fragmented survivals and their provenance.

Malchus treated Western, as well as Eastern, affairs in some detail. He has a penchant for elaborate accounts of embassies and delegations. Military set pieces are strikingly absent. Nowhere is there overt mention of personal involvement on the historian's part.

The biographical approach is marked. Prejudice is overt. Unfairness and inconsistency are discernible in the accounts of Leo and Zeno. Yet balance is achieved in the accounts of these rulers, and of other villains. The relatively rare exercises in eulogy are reasoned, as in the case of Pamprepius, or reflect a *parti-pris* as in the matter of Erythrius.

Religious matters are kept to a minimum. Christian phraseologies coexist with the commendations of Proclus and Pamprepius, but enough has been said on this question above.

Some of Malchus' personality shows through. He is severe on sexual "excess" (frs. 8 and 9, and the notice of Longinus). Homosexuality is particularly abhorred and is branded as a "foreign" vice (fr. 9); which attitudes, of course, do not confirm Malchus as a Christian. We have seen that he was disposed to nasty generalizations about the barbarian character (frs. 8a, 19), though this did not prevent him from taking their part in the matter of complaints against Zeno (fr. 19) or from accepting the claims made for the acumen of Odovacar (fr. 10). It is hardly surprising for a sophist-historian to display partiality toward men of letters and their profession (frs. 2a, 20).

⁵⁸ It may be worth nothing that Pamprepius is μέγιστον ἤδη δυναμένῳ in the *Suda's* entry for Salustius (S 63).

⁵⁹ Apart, that is, from the good press accorded to the senator Severus in fr. 3.

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*, 506–7.

Contempt for the mob is equally predictable (frs. 8, 20), as is the implied scorn of banausic arts (fr. 7).

Malchus is clearly not objective, but to what extent he is factually reliable is hard to determine, since he is the basic (frequently the only) source for what he describes. He may be in error in saying that Pamprepus came from Egyptian Thebes. Other sources, when they specify his origins, assign him to Panopolis.⁶¹ Obviously, Thebes could simply be a mistake for Thebaid. Yet Pamprepus was a well-known figure, clearly studied by Malchus with sympathetic attention. If he is wrong, it is both surprising and disappointing.

Other possible mistakes were considered earlier.⁶² Yet, although not a unique compliment from the Patriarch, it is significant that Photius, who was clearly wary of Malchus' religion (or lack of it), as opposed to the orthodox Candidus, regarded him as a fine historian, a veritable κανών for emulation.⁶³ He is nowhere accused of error or bias in religious or secular matters, and is lauded for his style, to which topic I now advert, as a fitting end to this paper.

Photius asserts that Malchus was a successful sophist. Thus, we can expect a conscious and competent stylist. From what is known of Photius' literary criticism,⁶⁴ Malchus must have avoided digressions, eschewed any excess of poeticisms and the like, and kept both clear and relevant. Bury thought him "clear and unaffected." To judge by the Photian notice, that was not true of Candidus, which is something to bear in mind when pondering the authorship of anonymous fragments.

It has been shown that Malchus does not appear to have indulged in elaborate and suspect military set pieces to the degree that Priscus did, fragment 1b. It seems, however, that he did not follow the apparent disdain for speeches which has been ascribed to Olympiodorus. Verbatim extracts, both short and substantial are present in a number of passages. Zeno predominates in these (frs. 8a, 9, 10, 18), but we also have a short speech by Gaiseric (fr. 3), two outbursts by Theodoric Strabo (fr. 15), another speech by the same (fr. 18), and the actual words of the senators in a debate with Zeno (fr. 11). Some of these will be genuine, perhaps reflecting Malchus' researches into documents and conversations with witnesses: items such as Strabo's outpourings were surely literary confections.

Some simple Latinisms are employed: σιλεντιάριος (fr. 2); μάγιστρος (fr. 11); πατρίκιος (frs. 10, 18); and τῶν περιβάτων (fr. 11). On other occasions, Greek equivalents are preferred: we find μισθοφόροι οἰκεῖοι for *bucellarii* (fr. 18); ἀρχεῖον for *praetorium* (fr. 18); and (foolishly) μέδιμνος for *modius* (fr. 15).⁶⁵

⁶¹ Panopolis is the provenance given in John of Antioch, fr. 211. 2, and in the *Suda* in two notices other than the fragment of Malchus it preserves on Pamprepus (the section of P 137 that comes from Damascius, and S 63). It is accepted by Bury, Stein, and Alan Cameron, *op. cit.*, 472.

⁶² See note 51.

⁶³ Herodotus is the canon of Ionic dialect (*Bibl.*, cod. 60) and Thucydides of Attic (cods. 60, 71).

⁶⁴ See La Rue van Hook, "The Literary Criticism in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius," *CPh*, 4 (1909), 178–89; G. L. Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius," *Hellenika*, 17 (1962), 132–69.

⁶⁵ Note also δεκατήλογος for *exactor* (fr. 1) and ἐπίτροπος for *procurator* (fr. 13); cf. H. J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (Toronto, 1974), 143–44.

Malchus does not go so far as Olympiodorus, whose willingness to include such effects as ὑπατος δισίγνατος earned him the displeasure of Photius.⁶⁶ Notable also in this context is the absence in Malchus of the word ῥῆξ, which Olympiodorus used to denote a leader of an individual tribe, properly distinguishing it from φύλαρχος, the commander of a confederacy.⁶⁷ Malchus has this latter precision (fr. 1), but employs ἀρχηγός of a barbarian chieftain (frs. 2, 4).

Inconsistency is manifest in the matter of both Christian and Roman terminologies. Whilst *presbyter* is painstakingly glossed (fr. 18), ἐπίσκοπος is employed without ado (frs. 1, 7); μοναχοί requires apology, albeit this is something of a special case⁶⁸ with the late Greek historians. Occasionally, ἱερεὺς or ἀρχιερεὺς is substituted for ἐπίσκοπος (frs. 1, 18). *Domestici* and *foederati* are explained as Latinisms (frs. 11, 16, and 18). An irritating example of affectation is the phrase "tented Arabs, which they call Saracens" (fr. 1).

As is the case with Agathias,⁶⁹ a medley of stylistic influences and effects is manifest in Malchus. There are archaistic flourishes: σύρφαξ is used to describe the mob (fr. 8), although that word had been ridiculed long ago by Lucian (*Lex.* 4), an author with whom Malchus may have been familiar. A lone dual (δυσὶν σχολαῖν) can be discerned (fr. 17); so can a hyper-Atticism, namely a false use of ποί (fr. 18). This mood may have caused the anachronistic use of "Long Walls" in the context of Constantinople of a period before their construction (fr. 16).⁷⁰

Various authors were drawn on. The comparison of Harmatus to Paris (fr. 8) naturally evokes the Homeric epithet γυναιμανής. A compound verb συνεποτρύνω (fr. 10) is elsewhere known only from Sophocles (*Electra* 299). The sonorous epithet παλαιόπλουτος (fr. 18) seems first to have surfaced in Thucydides 8. 28. The striking phrase πολιτική σύνεσις, employed of both Odovacar and Pampreprius, although of Aristotelian pedigree, is probably derived from Lucian.⁷¹ Several usages were favorites of Xenophon: προνομή (fr. 1), μαστροπεύω (fr. 10), and γήδιον (fr. 19) can be instanced. Indeed, an explanation of the fact that the *Suda* twice⁷² attaches the name of Malchus to items from the *Anabasis* could be that Malchus was identified in the compiler's mind as an imitator of Xenophon.

Let it be noted that Malchus was no more successful than any other writer in maintaining consistency of style. The constant use of οικείος, late words such as παραδυναστεύω and καρδοκία (fr. 9), and late forms of the order of φιλαφρόνως (frs. 8, 13) are revealing. However, the fragments suggest that the historian was no extremist in style, and it may be just to conclude that he would not have been embarrassed by any "lapses" into the vernacular.

⁶⁶ *Bibl.*, cod. 80.

⁶⁷ Cf. Thompson, *op. cit.*, 43.

⁶⁸ See Averil Cameron, *Agathias*, 85.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 65–66.

⁷⁰ Theophylact, 1. 4. 8, found it necessary to refer to them as the "so-called Long Walls."

⁷¹ *De Hist. Conscr.*, 61. G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim, 1956), 31, could not find a parallel. The phrase can be found in Aristotle, *Politics*, 1291a. I am writing elsewhere on the expression vis-à-vis Lucian and Malchus.

⁷² For the passages, see Müller, fr. 21.

A pronounced feature of the style of Malchus is the *hapax legomenon*. Some examples were earlier on parade. Worthy of note are: εὐπαρόδευτος (fr. 8), ἐρυθροπρόσωπος (fr. 8), συβαριτικῶς (fr. 9), πολιτικοκάπηλος (fr. 9). A further one, not registered in *LSJ* (or its Supplement) is the verb διασυλάω (fr. 2).

One item stands out. In fragment 8, the signs of physical passion between Harmatus and Zenonis are described thus: ῥίψεις οὖν ὁμμάτων ἐπ' ἀλλήλους ἐγίγνοντο καὶ παρεκστροφαὶ συνεχεῖς προσώπων καὶ μειδιαμάτων μεταδόσεις. It has not been noticed hitherto that this is, with the exception of two words, a verbatim reproduction of Plutarch, *Sulla*, 35. 5, on the dictator and Valeria. The changes are παρεκστροφαὶ for παρεπιστροφαὶ, and μεταδόσεις for διαδόσεις. It is notable that the former change is a *hapax legomenon*, which helps my former ascription of this fragment to Malchus rather than Candidus. An excellent sense of parody is discernible. Plutarch's next words were τέλος δέ, followed by the marriage of Sulla and Valeria. Malchus went on πόνος τε μετὰ ταῦτα ἔρωτος, culminating in the statement that the guilty pair were healed μίξεως ἰατρεία, a phrase which echoes Malchus' views on sex elsewhere expressed.

All in all, Malchus was a readable and effective stylist. Less florid than Eunapius, less given to discursive and literary set pieces than Priscus, not so jarring in Latinisms as Olympiodorus, less of a bizarre medley than Agathias, and infinitely removed from the insane verbiage of Theophylact. The surviving fragments make one wish for more. That cannot be said of all late Greek historians.